

ARTICLE \_\_\_\_

RESOLUTION SEEKING TO OFFER TOWN MEETING OPTIONS FOR COMPLYING  
WITH THE MBTA COMMUNITIES ACT

(Submitted by: Neil Gordon; Richard Benka; John Doggett; Jane Gilman; Nancy Heller;  
Jonathan Margolis; Linda Olson Pehlke; Marty Rosenthal)

To see if the Town will adopt the following Resolution:

WHEREAS the Massachusetts Department of Housing and Community Development (“DHCD”) has enacted guidelines that impose a December 31, 2023, compliance deadline for MBTA “Rapid Transit” communities such as Brookline to present zoning plans complying with the so-called “MBTA Communities Act” (“MBTA-CA”), G.L. ch. 40A, § 3A, as determined by application of a DHCD “Compliance Model; and

WHEREAS Brookline’s Planning and Community Development Department (“Planning Department”) has developed a single strategy that would involve substantial rezoning of a 48-acre district centered on the Harvard Street corridor as well as neighboring streets, but other options should be considered; and

WHEREAS while it has been repeatedly claimed that there is no “up-zoning” contemplated, the Harvard Street strategy, in order to comply with DHCD guidelines, assumes the elimination of all parking requirements for new developments along Harvard Street, the elimination of any requirement for commercial or other publicly accessible space (e.g., retail, restaurant, personal services, professional services) even on the first floor, the elimination of floor area ratio restrictions on density, and a 48-foot height limit rather than the existing staggered building height limits; and

WHEREAS all of these factors contribute to significant increases in permissible density from redevelopment that could seriously threaten existing businesses, commercial vitality and existing moderately priced housing; disrupt neighborhoods; and ignore the need for open space and the critical need to increase our tree canopy; and

WHEREAS the Harvard Street strategy is focused solely on pursuing MBTA-CA compliance with the single 48-acre zoning district (which could, in fact, have to expand even further into neighboring streets), although the DHCD guidelines do not require a single area; and

WHEREAS the number of actual, existing multi-family (3-plus) units in Brookline already far exceeds the MBTA-CA “capacity” requirements, a fact not recognized by the DHCD guidelines; and

WHEREAS unlike the Harvard Street strategy, utilizing multiple areas in Town to comply with the MBTA-CA, including existing three-family and other multi-family districts or portions of other corridors, would not require the Town to impose potentially negative changes on the Harvard Street corridor and would not concentrate the potential for additional multi-family

housing and the potential impacts on school population on only three elementary schools (Ridley, Lawrence and Pierce); and

WHEREAS recent successful rezoning efforts have been guided by resident committees with staff and consultant support, where the committees reflect appropriate technical skills along with representation from affected constituencies, to increase the credibility of their recommendations and the likelihood of acceptance by Town Meeting; and

WHEREAS the Harvard Street strategy and the chosen process raise significant concerns that could well result in the defeat of that strategy at the November 2023 Town Meeting and it would be imprudent for the Town to “put all its eggs in one basket” without having the option of fully considering other options for complying with the MBTA-CA; and

WHEREAS it is prudent to establish a resident-guided process that will, to the extent possible, ensure the development of alternative strategies for MBTA-CA compliance that could be utilized by themselves or in conjunction with a modified form of the Harvard Street strategy, and that will involve public engagement and analysis of potential impacts of not only the Harvard Street strategy but also alternative strategies;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that Town Meeting

- A. Requests the Select Board and the Town’s legislative delegation to initiate or continue efforts to seek appropriate modifications to the DHCD deadline and guidelines; and further
- B. Requests the Moderator to appoint a committee to identify additional potential options for complying with the MBTA Communities Act; and further,
- C. Requests the Select Board to direct the Planning Department to provide staff support to said Moderator’s Committee in analyzing both the Harvard Street strategy’s potential impacts, including impacts on Town and School services and risks to existing businesses, and other potential options for MBTA-CA compliance, including without limitation applying the DHCD Compliance Model and developing appropriate site plan review standards.

Or act on anything relative thereto.

#### PETITIONERS’ EXPLANATION

1. Brookline is not required to create a “mega district” to comply with the MBTA-CA

The DHCD guidelines require Brookline to have a “minimum land area” of 41 acres with “multi-family unit capacity” of 6,990 units (25% of the Town’s current number of units) as determined by a DHCD “Compliance Model.” In response, the Harvard Street strategy has identified a single 48-acre district encompassing the entire length of Harvard Street from Station Street to Verndale Street (interrupted only for a block at Coolidge Corner). Moreover, because properties

along Harvard Street -- even with the substantial zoning changes contemplated by the Harvard Street strategy -- apparently yield only 5,400 of the required 6,990 unit “capacity,” the Planning Department has actually included contiguous portions of Stearns Road, Littell Road, Alton Court, St. Paul Street, Webster Place, Kent Street, Station Street, Stedman Street and Beals Street in the so-called “Harvard Street” plan.

The Town, however, is not required to concentrate the impact of the MBTA-CA on only one “mega district.” The DHCD guidelines actually state, for example, that

- “[i]f an MBTA community has two or more zoning districts in which multi-family housing is allowed as of right, then two or more districts may be considered cumulatively to meet the minimum land area and minimum multi-family unit capacity requirements”;
- “no portion of the district that is less than 5 contiguous acres [of] land will count toward the minimum [land] size requirement”; and
- “at least half of the multi-family zoning district land areas must comprise contiguous lots of land.”

DHCD guidelines also allow the inclusion of areas that are already developed and do not limit “capacity” calculations to lots that are vacant. Thus, the guidelines make clear that

- “[n]othing ... should be interpreted as a mandate to construct a specified number of housing units, nor as a housing production target”;
- “capacity” simply means “that a sufficient number of multi-family housing units could be added to or replace existing uses and structures over time – even though such additions or replacements may be unlikely to occur soon”; and
- all privately owned property, even if already developed, can be included in calculating “capacity” unless development is prohibited to protect private or public water supplies or the property is used for institutional uses such as a hospital, utility, or private school, college or university.

Furthermore, DHCD guidelines expressly allow “site plan review” with by-laws that impose conditions on “the appearance and layout” of specific projects, including the regulation of matters such as vehicular access and circulation, screening of adjacent properties, and the “architectural design of a building.” Because the door is open to utilizing site plan review and to considering multiple areas in Town, including multiple commercial areas and existing three-family and multi-family zones, MBTA-CA compliance could generate fewer negative impacts than a single-minded pursuit of the Harvard Street strategy.

## 2. It is erroneous to argue that the Harvard Street strategy is not up-zoning

It has been repeatedly argued that the Harvard Street strategy provides the potential for growth “without up-zoning,” that “[n]o up-zoning [is] required” and that the strategy will “facilitate infill for both housing/commercial without up-zoning.”

Planopedia, a source of recognized urban design terms, defines “upzoning” as options “to create new development capacity,” including “increas[ing] the floor-area ratios,” “[i]ncreased height restrictions, lower parking requirements, or density bonuses.” The Harvard Street strategy includes

- replacing maximum floor-area ratios (currently 1.0 to 1.75 in most of the area) with “form-based zoning,” thus eliminating (not merely increasing) the allowable floor-area ratios and, with the proposed increase in height limits, essentially tripling the allowable density of properties in the area;
- increasing height restrictions to 48 feet (from 40 feet in most of the area), a 20% increase;
- eliminating various setback and open space requirements in favor of “form-based zoning;”
- eliminating the requirement for publicly accessible first floor space;
- and eliminating (not just reducing) parking restrictions.

The assertion that there would be no “upzoning” is erroneous.

3. The DHCD guidelines are particularly troublesome when applied to the entirety of the existing Harvard Street commercial corridor

Choosing a single, huge 48-acre land area, rather than doing the additional work of objectively pursuing ways in which the MBTA-CA could be achieved with other less disruptive approaches, will focus potential enrollment impacts on only three of the Town’s eight elementary schools and potentially disrupt a vibrant commercial corridor.

First of all, the ironic choice of a commercial corridor as the venue for compliance triggers State DHCD guidelines that flatly prohibit the Town from requiring publicly accessible, commercial activities on the ground floor, or, indeed, anywhere in a building. The threat to commercial viability and to local business is clear. The Town has offered two responses, both of which would likely create further problems:

- First, the Town has apparently suggested, or will suggest, that DHCD remove this restriction. The problem, of course, is that the Harvard Street “mega district” could become even larger than 48 acres, or the “canyonization” of Harvard Street even greater, if the Town’s request for changes to the DHCD guidelines were allowed. Thus, if the Town were permitted to require first-floor commercial space, the “as of right” multi-family housing floor area in buildings would be reduced and the “capacity” target of 6,990 units could be reached only by further expanding the district into even more neighboring streets, or by increasing the height limit and thus density even further beyond the contemplated 48 feet.
- Second, the Planning Department has said that it could provide “incentives” for developers to include commercial uses to avoid dead, publicly inaccessible first-floor spaces in the critical Harvard Street commercial area. The “incentives,” however, would likely require either financial support from the Town in the form of tax abatement agreements, a reduction in the Town’s affordable housing requirements, or zoning

incentives allowing even greater density and the resulting “canyonization” beyond that already contemplated by the Harvard Street strategy.

Second, because the DHCD model deducts space required for parking in calculating housing “capacity,” the Planning Department’s Harvard Street strategy reaches a “capacity” of 5,400 units on Harvard Street, and 6,990 units in the entire MBTA-CA district, only by eliminating all required parking for new development in the district:

- The absence of any minimum on-site parking requirements imposes potential negative impacts on potential patronage in the Harvard Street commercial area (if any commercial activity is able to survive), on surrounding neighborhoods, and even on the residents of any new multi-family housing. Is it realistic to proceed on the assumption that no residential parking is needed?
- Including any on-site parking requirement to avoid congestion and impacts on neighborhood streets and municipally owned parking lots would require that building heights be increased even more or that the MBTA-CA district be expanded even further into surrounding neighborhoods to achieve the desired “capacity.”

Thus, the focus on a single huge area, and a commercial area to boot, creates problems under the DHCD guidelines that could potentially be avoided. Indeed, these problems would, as discussed below, exacerbate other inequities generated by the application of the MBTA-CA.

4. Brookline’s already-existing multi-family units far exceed the MBTA-CA “capacity” guidelines

The DHCD guidelines identify Brookline as one of twelve “Rapid Transit” communities -- Braintree, Brookline, Cambridge, Chelsea, Everett, Malden, Medford, Milton, Newton, Quincy, Revere, and Somerville – that are required to have a “minimum multi-family unit capacity” equivalent to 25% of the total number of housing units in the community according to the 2020 U.S. Census.<sup>1</sup>

The Town’s already-existing multi-family units, according to the 2021 U.S. Census American Community Survey, are already 66.8% of the Town’s housing units.

- The percentage of multi-family units in the twelve “Rapid Transit” communities ranges from 10.8% to 71.9%.
- Brookline is one of only three of the twelve communities, along with Chelsea and Cambridge, where multi-family housing already constitutes more than 2/3 of the total housing units.
- Thus, Brookline’s actual, already-existing multi-family inventory is more than 2 ½ times the MBTA’s “capacity” goal.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup><https://www.mass.gov/doc/compliance-guidelines-for-multi-family-zoning-districts-under-section-3a-of-the-zoning-act/download>

<sup>2</sup>[https://censusreporter.org/data/table/?table=B25024&geo\\_ids=16000US2509210,05000US25021,31000US14460,04000US25,01000US&primary\\_geo\\_id=16000US2509210#valueTypeestimate](https://censusreporter.org/data/table/?table=B25024&geo_ids=16000US2509210,05000US25021,31000US14460,04000US25,01000US&primary_geo_id=16000US2509210#valueTypeestimate)

- It has also been stated that an even higher percentage (75%) of the units in Brookline's Green Line service area are multi-family, more than three times the MBTA-CA "capacity" goal.<sup>3</sup>

But whether the multi-family percentage of Brookline's existing housing units is 2/3 or 3/4, Brookline far exceeds the MBTA-CA 25% "capacity" standard and cannot credibly be accused of excluding multi-family housing.

5. The MBTA-CA expects other municipalities to subsidize Boston and Cambridge and commercial developers in those cities

Over the past decade, as set forth in more detail in Appendix "A,"

- Boston and Cambridge have effectively shifted to other communities the cost of providing housing and related municipal services, including public education, for the households of workers attracted by commercial development in those two cities.
- Those two cities have gained tens of millions (Cambridge) or hundreds of millions (Boston) of dollars of additional property tax levies from commercial development, a windfall they do not share with other communities. On a per capital basis, Boston's tax levy increase from commercial development is 5 times that of Brookline, and that of Cambridge is 7 times Brookline's.
- More specifically, in the decade after 2010, Boston added 124,800 new jobs but provided only 29,200 additional housing units (only 23% of the new jobs); Cambridge added 35,500 new jobs but provided only 6,600 additional housing units (only 19% of the new jobs); and Brookline added 1,200 new jobs while providing 1,500 additional housing units (25% more units than the number of new jobs).
- Studies conducted by Boston and Cambridge themselves confirm the fact that other municipalities already house the vast majority of new workers attracted to those cities. Those studies further confirm that the housing "linkage payments" paid by developers in those two cities are a trivial percentage of the additional housing costs imposed by commercial development (without even accounting for the costs of municipal services necessitated by additional housing).
- And, as with their commercial property tax windfalls, the housing linkage payments received by Boston and Cambridge are not shared with the municipalities actually housing the vast majority of new workers from those two cities.

6. Residential taxpayers in Brookline bear the brunt of providing Town and School services

As further set forth in Appendix "A," because of Brookline's relatively small commercial tax base and limited commercial growth compared to Boston and Cambridge,

- Residential properties in Brookline pay a much larger percentage of Brookline's property tax levy – twice the share paid by Boston's residential properties and almost 2 ½ times the share paid by residential properties in Cambridge.

---

<sup>3</sup> Boston Globe, March 4, 2023, p.A-9 (Linda Olson Pehlke; Readers' Forum).

- Brookline, like other “bedroom” communities, has faced multiple operating overrides and debt exclusion votes, primarily to meet school needs.
- The taxes on residential properties have already increased dramatically, even without including the impact of the debt exclusion for fire station rehabilitation voted in 2022 and the pending 2023 operating override and Pierce School debt exclusion.
- In contrast, Boston and Cambridge, with their commercial property tax growth and offloading of housing and municipal service responsibilities to other communities, have had NO operating overrides or debt exclusions in at least 35 years, if ever.<sup>4</sup>

And, as a final irony, Boston is totally excluded from any obligation under the MBTA-CA to provide multi-family housing capacity.

## 7. A closing comment

Despite the obvious negative fiscal impacts of Brookline’s already sparse commercial development and despite the fact that DHCD guidelines preclude the Town from requiring space for commercial activity, the Harvard Street strategy utilizes a major corridor defined by commercial activity along almost its entire length as the location for efforts to satisfy the MBTA-CA.<sup>5</sup>

The Harvard Street strategy, under external time pressure,<sup>6</sup> proposes changes that will have potentially serious and irreversible impacts enduring for decades. Plunging ahead with this single strategy would leave the Town with no viable alternatives that might be acceptable.<sup>7</sup> Town Meeting should not be so severely hamstrung in its future decision making. The more prudent course would examine available alternatives for complying with the MBTA-CA. This resolution is an effort to start that process.

---

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.mass.gov/lists/reports-relating-to-property-tax-data-and-statistics#proposition-2-1/2-referendum-data->

<sup>5</sup> Indeed, as noted above, even if the DHCD guidelines prohibiting commercial mandates were relaxed, any mandate to include commercial activity would likely either require that the zone be expanded even further into adjoining neighborhoods or that the proposed zoning be changed to allow even greater density and “canyonization” through increased height limits.

<sup>6</sup> The Town and other municipalities are apparently seeking an extension of the December 31, 2023 deadline for submitting final plans. Even if that time is not extended, the Boston Globe reported on December 16, 2022, that DHCD on or about December 14, 2022 issued a letter stating that “Once a community comes back into compliance, the housing authority funding will be restored.” <https://www.bostonglobe.com/2022/12/16/business/state-soften-budget-cuts-towns-that-dont-comply-with-new-mbta-housing-law/>

<sup>7</sup> In its MBTA-CA Action Plan, the Planning Department recognized “the fears of obliterating our small commercial tenants”; that “[w]ithout having the ability to require commercial use on the ground floor in our core commercial districts along Harvard Street, we may not be able to secure a majority vote at Town Meeting”; that “we are unsure whether Town Meeting will agree to no parking minimums by right”; and that “[w]hile no parking minimums by right may seem an obvious policy solution, it may prove to not be a politically palatable outcome.” <https://www.mass.gov/doc/submitted-section-3a-action-plans/download>

## APPENDIX “A”

### I. Commercial New Growth over the Past Decade

#### Boston:

- Has averaged an increase of over \$50 million of “new growth” annually in its property tax levy limit from Commercial, Industrial and Personal Property (e.g., laboratory equipment) (“CIP”) development.
- This bonanza that has not abated even after the pandemic, with an additional \$69.3 million property tax levy increase from CIP new growth in the most recent Fiscal Year 2023.<sup>8</sup>

#### Cambridge:

- Has averaged an increase of over \$13.3 million annually in its property tax levy limit from CIP development.
- As in Boston, this has not abated even after the pandemic, with an additional \$21.1 million CIP new growth increase in Fiscal Year 2023.<sup>9</sup> Each annual increase becomes part of the permanent tax levy limit for all future years, being aggregated year after year and further increased by 2 ½% annually under Proposition 2 ½.

#### Brookline, in contrast:

- Has had an increase averaging only \$0.9 million annually in its property tax levy limit from CIP development
- And, in fact, this number fell after the pandemic, with only a \$792,628 CIP new growth tax levy increase in Fiscal Year 2023.<sup>10</sup>

#### In per capita terms:

- Over the past decade the annual per capita new growth in the tax levy limit from CIP development in Boston has been 5 times that of Brookline, and the increase in Cambridge has been more than 7 times that of Brookline.
- And none of the increased CIP property taxes collected by Boston and Cambridge are shared with other communities.
- This discrepancy would not be troubling if Boston and Cambridge were in fact housing the additional workers and their households and providing the costs attendant on that housing, including the costs of providing municipal services and public education. As shown below, however, that is not the case.

---

<sup>8</sup> [https://dls.gateway.dor.state.ma.us/reports/rdPage.aspx?rdReport=NewGrowth.NewGrowth\\_dash\\_v2\\_test](https://dls.gateway.dor.state.ma.us/reports/rdPage.aspx?rdReport=NewGrowth.NewGrowth_dash_v2_test)

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.



## II. “Off-loading” of Housing and Municipal Service Responsibilities by Boston and Cambridge to Other Communities.

State and federal data:

- Between the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter of 2010 and the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter of 2019 (before pandemic distortions), Boston added 124,800 new jobs, Cambridge added 35,500 new jobs, and Brookline added 1,200 new jobs.<sup>11</sup>
- The U.S. Census shows a growth in housing units between 2010 and 2020 in Boston of 29,200 units (only 23% of the new jobs), in Cambridge of 6,600 units (only 19% of the new jobs), and in Brookline of 1,500 units (25% more units than the new jobs added in Brookline).<sup>12</sup>

Boston’s own 2016 study:

- Found that only 24% of new workers in Boston commercial developments seek housing in Boston.
- Also found that a linkage payment of \$85.55 per square foot of CIP development – in 2016 dollars -- would be needed to provide housing for low-, moderate- and middle-income workers among just the 24% of additional workers seeking housing in Boston.<sup>13</sup>
- Extrapolated to the communities that provide housing for the other 76% of workers, that \$85.55 figure would be \$360 per square foot, even without accounting for increases in costs between 2016 and 2023.
- Yet in contrast to that required \$360 per square foot – in 2016 dollars -- Boston currently collects a trivial housing linkage fee of only \$13.00 per square foot (and only for developments over 100,000 square feet), and none of that is shared with the communities that are providing housing for 76% of the workers generated by Boston’s commercial development.
- Proposed increases of the housing linkage fee to approximately \$25.85 per square foot for laboratory space and \$19.40 per square foot for other commercial uses<sup>14</sup> would still be a trivial part of the \$360 per square foot of housing costs – in 2016 dollars -- imposed by commercial development, and none of that amount would be shared with the other communities such as Brookline providing housing for 76% of the workers attracted by Boston CIP development.

Cambridge’s own 2019 study:

- Found that only 13% of new workers in Cambridge commercial developments seek housing in Cambridge.

---

<sup>11</sup> <https://lmi.dua.eol.mass.gov/LMI/EmploymentAndWages>

<sup>12</sup> <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/all?q=boston%20ma%20housing%20units> (Boston);  
<https://data.census.gov/cedsci/all?q=cambridge%20ma%20housing%20units> (Cambridge);  
<https://data.census.gov/cedsci/all?q=housing%20units%20brookline%20ma> (Brookline)

<sup>13</sup> <https://www.bostonplans.org/getattachment/b883ad7f-fc1f-4c83-ac88-1334e519742d>

<sup>14</sup> 84% of the increased fees, with the remaining 16% going to job training.

- Found that a linkage payment of \$55.27 per square foot of CIP development – in 2019 dollars – would be needed to provide housing for low-, moderate- and middle-income workers among just the 13% of additional workers seeking housing in Cambridge.<sup>15</sup>
- Extrapolated to the communities that provide housing for the other 87% of workers, that \$55.27 figure would be \$415 per square foot, even without accounting for increases in costs between 2019 and 2023.
- In contrast to that required \$415 per square foot – in 2019 dollars -- Cambridge currently collects a trivial housing linkage fee of only \$20.10 per square foot (and only for developments over 30,000 square feet), and none of that is shared with the communities that are providing housing and the attendant public services for 87% of the workers generated by Cambridge’s commercial development.

To make matters even worse, the MBTA-CA:

- Excludes Boston, one of the principal beneficiaries of commercial development taxes, from the mandate to provide multi-family housing.<sup>16</sup>
- Under the DHCD guidelines, actually places a “cap” on affordable housing requirements, stating that, in the absence of an “economic feasibility analysis” by a “third party acceptable to DHCD, and using a methodology and format acceptable to DHCD,” zoning cannot require more than 10 percent of the units in a project to be affordable, and the income cap cannot be less than 80% of the area median income (so that a municipality cannot, for example, choose a cap on income that is less than \$112,150 for a household of four).

### III. Impact on Residential Taxpayers in Brookline, Boston and Cambridge

Burden of paying local property taxes:

- Brookline residential properties pay 83.5% of the total property tax levy.
- Boston residential properties pay only 41.7%.
- Cambridge residential properties pay only 34.2%.<sup>17</sup>

Overrides and debt exclusions:

- Brookline, like other “bedroom communities” without the extensive commercial growth of Boston and Cambridge, has required increasingly frequent operating overrides, largely to fund school expenses (1994; 2008 (\$6.2 million); 2015 (\$7.665 million); 2018 (\$6.6 million); proposed 2023 (approximately \$12 million)).

---

<sup>15</sup> [https://www.cambridgema.gov/-/media/Files/CDD/Housing/incentivezoning/hsg\\_Incentive\\_Zoning\\_Nexus\\_Study\\_20191211.pdf](https://www.cambridgema.gov/-/media/Files/CDD/Housing/incentivezoning/hsg_Incentive_Zoning_Nexus_Study_20191211.pdf)

<sup>16</sup> And Cambridge has stated in its MBTA-CA Action Plan that its “most likely” zoning strategy to comply with the MBTA-CA is essentially the status quo: “An existing zoning district or districts that might already comply with the Section 3A Guidelines.” <https://www.mass.gov/doc/submitted-section-3a-action-plans/download>

<sup>17</sup> <https://dls.gateway.dor.state.ma.us/reports/rdPage.aspx?rdReport=Dashboard.TrendAnalysisReports.TaxLevyByCity>

- Brookline has likewise had multiple debt exclusions primarily to meet school needs (1990, new Lincoln School; 1995, High School renovation; 2015, new Ridley (\$120 million); 2018, renovate and expand High School (\$238 million); 2019, new Driscoll (\$120 million); 2022, fire station life safety and gender equity (\$65 million); proposed 2023, new Pierce (\$173 million expected Town share)).
- In contrast, Boston and Cambridge have had no operating overrides or debt exclusions in at least 35 years, if ever.

The impact on residential property taxes, without the impact of the \$65 million 2022 fire station debt exclusion (which has not yet affected property taxes) or the potential impacts of the proposed 2023 \$173 million Pierce School debt exclusion and 2023 \$12 million operating override:

- With the owner-occupied property tax exemption, from FY18 to FY23, taxes have already increased as follows (including the CPA surcharge):
  - On the median single-family home, from \$11,882 to \$17,160;
  - On the median condominium, from \$3,933 to \$4,659;
  - On the median 2-family home, from \$12,420 to \$17,749; and
  - On the median 3-family home, from \$13,607 to \$18,753.
- Taxes on the median apartment building have increased from \$27,201 to \$36,767.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> [https://www.brooklinema.gov/DocumentCenter/View/37282/FY2023-Classification-Hearing-Presentation?bidId=\(adjusted for actual residential exemption of 20%, commercial tax shift of 1.745, and CPA surcharge per conversation with Chief Assessor\);https://meetings.brooklinema.gov/OnBaseAgendaOnline/Documents/ViewDocument/Select\\_Board\\_948\\_Agenda\\_Packet\\_11\\_27\\_2018\\_6\\_30\\_00\\_PM.pdf?meetingId=948&documentType=AgendaPacket&itemId=0&publishId=0&isSection=false](https://www.brooklinema.gov/DocumentCenter/View/37282/FY2023-Classification-Hearing-Presentation?bidId=(adjusted%20for%20actual%20residential%20exemption%20of%2020%2C%20commercial%20tax%20shift%20of%201.745%2C%20and%20CPA%20surcharge%20per%20conversation%20with%20Chief%20Assessor);https://meetings.brooklinema.gov/OnBaseAgendaOnline/Documents/ViewDocument/Select_Board_948_Agenda_Packet_11_27_2018_6_30_00_PM.pdf?meetingId=948&documentType=AgendaPacket&itemId=0&publishId=0&isSection=false)